

**REMARKS**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the attention accorded to the instant application.

Claims 374-379 are pending in the application.

**I. Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to the claims because of claim informalities. Applicants regret the typographical error which led to Applicants canceling claims 1-374 while starting new claims at 374. Applicants have corrected the minor error and clarifies that claims 1-373 have been canceled and claims 374-379 remain pending in the application.

**II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims 374-379 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,500 to Murphy (“Murphy”), U.S. Patent No. 5,790,074 to Rangedahl et al. (“Rangedahl”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,522,875 to Dowling et al. (“Dowling”).

Applicants have amended claims 374, 376, 377, 378 and 379 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. The present invention, as recited in the amended independent claims 374, 376, 377, 378 and 379, is directed to a method for securing a computer communications network supporting a network computing device with the method comprising the steps of embodying a GSU chip into the network computing device. The steps additionally include programming a GSU chip in the GSU-enabled network computing

device with a set of predetermined time and space coordinates. Importantly, the GSU-enabled network computing device generates a time stamp which provides an absolute time reference.

In contrast, Murphy is directed to a system for assuring the location integrity of a decryption chip used to receive and decrypt encrypted signals received from an encrypted signal source. Murphy teaches a decryption chip which is only licensed for certain locations. Murphy does not teach or suggest a client machine which includes a time stamp “providing an absolute time reference.”

Similarly, Rangedahl is directed to an automated location verification and authorization system for electronic devices. Rangedahl discloses a system for authorizing operation of a remote device employing a global positioning system which is connected to an authorization database. Importantly, Rangedahl does not teach or suggest that the remote device includes a time stamp “providing an absolute time reference.” There is no mention of any kind of time reference in the Rangedahl reference.

Similarly, Dowling is directed to a geographical web browser in a mobile unit. Dowling teaches using a mobile unit capable of receiving global positioning system receivers or local broadcast signals which are dependent on the physical location of the mobile unit. Dowling does not teach or suggest a mobile unit which includes a time stamp “providing an absolute time reference.”

The Examiner is reminded that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable


expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Since the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, either alone or in combination with each other, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been set forth. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that amended independent claims 374, 376, 377, 378 and 379 are allowable over the cited references. Claim 375, by its dependency on amended independent claim 374, is similarly allowable.

#### IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims 374-379 are now in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Bosco B. Kim  
Registration No. 41,896

Date: February 24, 2004  
REVEO, INC.  
85 Executive Boulevard  
Elmsford, New York 10523  
Telephone (914) 345-9555  
Facsimile: (914) 345-9558